SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: brendan.hanley@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:53

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

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

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

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

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

c/o: Brendan Hanley

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

Sent to **brendan.hanley@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

96. It is agreed by you, Brendan Hanley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

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

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

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

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

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

102. It is agreed by you, Brendan Hanley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

109. It is agreed by you, Brendan Hanley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

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

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

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

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

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

115. It is agreed by you, Brendan Hanley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

126. It is agreed by you, Brendan Hanley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

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

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

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

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

142. It is agreed by you, Brendan Hanley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Definition of Human Being

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

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

169. It is agreed by you, Brendan Hanley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

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

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: michael.kram@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:50

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

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

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

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

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

c/o: Michael Kram

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

Sent to **michael.kram@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

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

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

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

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

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

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michael Kram, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

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

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

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

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

10. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

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

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

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

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

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

16. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

33. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

45. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

74. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

98. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

112. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

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

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

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

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

117. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

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

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

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

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

122. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

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

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

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

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

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

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

150. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

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

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

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

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

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Kram, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

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

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

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

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

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

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

162. It is agreed by you, Michael Kram, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

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

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

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

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

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

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Definition of Human Being

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

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

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

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

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

171. It is agreed by Michael Kram, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

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

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: robert.kitchen@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:50

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

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

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

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

To: **Robert Kitchen** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Robert Kitchen

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

Sent to **robert.kitchen@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

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

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

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

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

7. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

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

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

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

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

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

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

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

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

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

37. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

39. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

61. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

85. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

113. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

122. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

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

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

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

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

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

128. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

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

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

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

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

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

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

135. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

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

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

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

139. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

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

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

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

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

144. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

162. It is agreed by you, Robert Kitchen, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Definition of Human Being

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

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

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

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

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

171. It is agreed by Robert Kitchen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

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

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: randy.hoback@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:50

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

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

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

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

To: **Randy Hoback** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Randy Hoback

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

Sent to **randy.hoback@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

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

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

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

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

7. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

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

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

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

32. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Randy Hoback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Randy Hoback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Randy Hoback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Randy Hoback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Randy Hoback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Randy Hoback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Randy Hoback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Randy Hoback, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Randy Hoback with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: luc.theriault@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:47

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Luc Theriault** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Luc Theriault

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **luc.theriault@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Luc Theriault, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Luc Theriault, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Theriault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Theriault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Theriault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Theriault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Theriault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Theriault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Luc Theriault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Luc Theriault, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Luc Theriault with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: gabriel.ste-marie@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:47

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Gabriel Marie** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Gabriel Marie

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **gabriel.ste-marie@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Gabriel Marie, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Gabriel Marie, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no

ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-

performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Gabriel Marie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Gabriel Marie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Gabriel Marie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Gabriel Marie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Gabriel Marie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Gabriel Marie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Gabriel Marie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Gabriel Marie, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Gabriel Marie with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: pascale.st-onge@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:47

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Pascale Onge** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Pascale Onge

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **pascale.st-onge@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Pascale Onge, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Pascale Onge, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Pascale Onge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Pascale Onge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Pascale Onge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Pascale Onge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Pascale Onge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Pascale Onge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Pascale Onge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Pascale Onge, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Pascale Onge with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: yves.robillard@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:44

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Yves Robillard** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Yves Robillard

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **yves.robillard@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Yves Robillard, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Yves Robillard, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Robillard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Robillard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Robillard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Robillard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Robillard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Robillard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Yves Robillard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Yves Robillard, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Yves Robillard with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: alain.rayes@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:44

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Alain Rayes** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Alain Rayes

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **alain.rayes@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Alain Rayes, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Alain Rayes, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Alain Rayes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Alain Rayes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Alain Rayes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Alain Rayes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Alain Rayes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Alain Rayes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Alain Rayes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Alain Rayes, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Alain Rayes with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: louis.plamondon@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:44

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Louis Plamondon** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Louis Plamondon

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **louis.plamondon@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Louis Plamondon, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Louis Plamondon, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of

statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place

yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in

part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Louis Plamondon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Louis Plamondon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty,

enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Louis Plamondon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Louis Plamondon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Louis Plamondon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Louis Plamondon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not

regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in

what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving

my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Louis Plamondon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Louis Plamondon, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Louis Plamondon with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: steven.mackinnon@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:41

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Steven Mackinnon** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Steven Mackinnon

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **steven.mackinnon@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Steven Mackinnon, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Steven Mackinnon, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine

difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of

that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law,

courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by

omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in

law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are

recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to

limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created

without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

“Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase

shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the

sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all

purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access

to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable

punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the

incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Mackinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Mackinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement

purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Mackinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to:

Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Mackinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Mackinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Mackinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or

may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’;

and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws

into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Steven Mackinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Steven Mackinnon, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Steven Mackinnon with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: joel.lightbound@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:41

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Joel Lightbound** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Joel Lightbound

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **joel.lightbound@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Joel Lightbound, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Joel Lightbound, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Lightbound, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Lightbound, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby

placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual

treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint

the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Lightbound, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law.

The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Lightbound, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Lightbound, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Lightbound, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Joel Lightbound, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Joel Lightbound, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Joel Lightbound with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: sebastien.lemire@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:41

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Sebastien Lemire** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Sebastien Lemire

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **sebastien.lemire@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Sebastien Lemire, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Sebastien Lemire, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the

Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Sebastien Lemire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Sebastien Lemire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Sebastien Lemire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Sebastien Lemire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Sebastien Lemire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Sebastien Lemire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule

for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Sebastien Lemire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Sebastien Lemire, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Sebastien Lemire with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: anthony.housefather@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:38

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Anthony Housefather** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Anthony Housefather

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **anthony.housefather@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Anthony Housefather, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Anthony Housefather, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil

rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights,

Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding

provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency

effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights,

along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this

case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the

proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard

trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form

the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing

of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then

notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability

to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that

requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the

lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Anthony Housefather, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest

performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Anthony Housefather, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your

obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any

matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to

restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Anthony Housefather, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Anthony Housefather, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Anthony Housefather, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly

correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Anthony Housefather, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission

has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given.” Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used

by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of

Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Anthony Housefather, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Anthony Housefather, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Anthony Housefather with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: steven.guilbeault@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:38

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Steven Guilbeault** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Steven Guilbeault

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **steven.guilbeault@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Steven Guilbeault, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Steven Guilbeault, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for

example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to

limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according

to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to

include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Guilbeault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial

interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Guilbeault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical

standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Guilbeault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Guilbeault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed

in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Guilbeault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Steven Guilbeault, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the

contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which

the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given.” Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of

Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Steven Guilbeault, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Steven Guilbeault, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Steven Guilbeault with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: jacques.gourde@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:38

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jacques Gourde** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jacques Gourde

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jacques.gourde@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jacques Gourde, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jacques Gourde, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jacques Gourde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs

must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jacques Gourde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jacques Gourde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jacques Gourde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jacques Gourde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jacques Gourde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jacques Gourde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jacques Gourde, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jacques Gourde with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: jean-yves.duclos@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:35

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Yves Duclos** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Yves Duclos

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jean-yves.duclos@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Yves Duclos, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Yves Duclos, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Duclos, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Duclos, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Duclos, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Duclos, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Duclos, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Duclos, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Yves Duclos, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Yves Duclos, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Yves Duclos with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: emmanuel.dubourg@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:35

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Emmanuel Dubourg** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Emmanuel Dubourg

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **emmanuel.dubourg@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Emmanuel Dubourg, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Emmanuel Dubourg, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding

cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to

perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as

outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the

following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical

gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered

to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First

Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was

in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re;

Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Emmanuel Dubourg, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Emmanuel Dubourg, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you

do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when

always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or

administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages

sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Emmanuel Dubourg, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Emmanuel Dubourg, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Emmanuel Dubourg, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Emmanuel Dubourg, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute

a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Emmanuel Dubourg, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Emmanuel Dubourg, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Emmanuel Dubourg with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: anju.dhillon@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:35

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Anju Dhillon** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Anju Dhillon

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **anju.dhillon@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Anju Dhillon, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Anju Dhillon, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Anju Dhillon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Anju Dhillon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Anju Dhillon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Anju Dhillon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Anju Dhillon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Anju Dhillon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Anju Dhillon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Anju Dhillon, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Anju Dhillon with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: elisabeth.briere@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:32

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Elisabeth Briere** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Elisabeth Briere

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **elisabeth.briere@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Elisabeth Briere, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Elisabeth Briere, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Elisabeth Briere, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Elisabeth Briere, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Elisabeth Briere, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Elisabeth Briere, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Elisabeth Briere, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Elisabeth Briere, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Elisabeth Briere, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Elisabeth Briere, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Elisabeth Briere with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: alexandre.boulerice@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:32

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Alexandre Boulerice** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Alexandre Boulerice

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **alexandre.boulerice@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Alexandre Boulerice, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Alexandre Boulerice, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Alexandre Boulerice, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Alexandre Boulerice, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Alexandre Boulerice, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Alexandre Boulerice, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Alexandre Boulerice, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Alexandre Boulerice, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are

aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Alexandre Boulerice, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Alexandre Boulerice, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of

Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Alexandre Boulerice with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: maxime.blanchette-joncas@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:32

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Maxime Joncas** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Maxime Joncas

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **maxime.blanchette-joncas@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Maxime Joncas, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an

ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Maxime Joncas, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military

receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues

as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research,

Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of

unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s)

to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless

damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to

them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The

administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase

the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified

Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Maxime Joncas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Maxime Joncas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Maxime Joncas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Maxime Joncas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Maxime Joncas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Maxime Joncas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Maxime Joncas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Maxime Joncas, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Maxime Joncas with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: heath.macdonald@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:29

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Heath Macdonald** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Heath Macdonald

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **heath.macdonald@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Heath Macdonald, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Heath Macdonald, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465

and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997]

1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and

security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In

accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American

Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil

allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Heath Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Heath Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by

financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Heath Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Heath Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Heath Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Heath Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has

taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly

dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or

any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because

there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with

informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Heath Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Heath Macdonald, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally

against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Heath Macdonald with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: lawrence.macaulay@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:29

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,

owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Lawrence Macaulay** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Lawrence Macaulay

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **lawrence.macaulay@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Lawrence Macaulay, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Lawrence Macaulay, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil

rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights,

Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding

provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency

effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights,

along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this

case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the

proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard

trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form

the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing

of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then

notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability

to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that

requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the

lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Lawrence Macaulay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest

performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Lawrence Macaulay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your

obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any

matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to

restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Lawrence Macaulay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Lawrence Macaulay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Lawrence Macaulay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly

correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Lawrence Macaulay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission

has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given.” Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used

by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of

Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Lawrence Macaulay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Lawrence Macaulay, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Lawrence Macaulay with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: sean.casey@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:29

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Sean Casey** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Sean Casey

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **sean.casey@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Sean Casey, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Sean Casey, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such

laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

“Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik,

President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase

shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will

result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Sean Casey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Sean Casey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Sean Casey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Sean Casey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Sean Casey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Sean Casey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Sean Casey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Sean Casey, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Sean Casey with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: rechie.valdez@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:26

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rechie Valdez** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rechie Valdez

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rechie.valdez@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rechie Valdez, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rechie Valdez, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rechie Valdez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rechie Valdez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rechie Valdez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rechie Valdez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rechie Valdez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rechie Valdez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rechie Valdez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rechie Valdez, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rechie Valdez with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: ryan.turnbull@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:26

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ryan Turnbull** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ryan Turnbull

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ryan.turnbull@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ryan Turnbull, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ryan Turnbull, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Turnbull, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Turnbull, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Turnbull, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Turnbull, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Turnbull, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Turnbull, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ryan Turnbull, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ryan Turnbull, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ryan Turnbull with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: leah.taylorroy@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:25

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Leah Taylorroy** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Leah Taylorroy

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **leah.taylorroy@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Leah Taylorroy, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Leah Taylorroy, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Taylorroy, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Taylorroy, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Taylorroy, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Taylorroy, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Taylorroy, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Taylorroy, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Leah Taylorroy, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Leah Taylorroy, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Leah Taylorroy with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: judy.sgro@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:23

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Judy Sgro** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Judy Sgro

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **judy.sgro@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Judy Sgro, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Judy Sgro, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of

private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Judy Sgro, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Judy Sgro, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Judy Sgro, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Judy Sgro, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Judy Sgro, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Judy Sgro, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Judy Sgro, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Judy Sgro, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Judy Sgro with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: marc.serre@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:23

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Marc Serre** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Marc Serre

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marc.serre@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Marc Serre, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Marc Serre, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and

responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Serre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Serre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Serre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Serre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Serre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Serre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Marc Serre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Marc Serre, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Marc Serre with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: kyle.seeback@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:22

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Kyle Seeback** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Kyle Seeback

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kyle.seeback@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Kyle Seeback, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Kyle Seeback, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Kyle Seeback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Kyle Seeback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Kyle Seeback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Kyle Seeback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Kyle Seeback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Kyle Seeback, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Kyle Seeback, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Kyle Seeback, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Kyle Seeback with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: pierre.poilievre@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:20

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Pierre Poilievre** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Pierre Poilievre

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **pierre.poilievre@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Pierre Poilievre, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Pierre Poilievre, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Poilievre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Poilievre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Poilievre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Poilievre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Poilievre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Poilievre, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Pierre Poilievre, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Pierre Poilievre, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Pierre Poilievre with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: rob.oliphant@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:20

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rob Oliphant** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rob Oliphant

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rob.oliphant@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rob Oliphant, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rob Oliphant, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Oliphant, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Oliphant, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Oliphant, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Oliphant, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Oliphant, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Oliphant, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rob Oliphant, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rob Oliphant, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rob Oliphant with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: jennifer.oconnell@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:19

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jennifer Oconnell** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jennifer Oconnell

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jennifer.oconnell@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jennifer Oconnell, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jennifer Oconnell, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465

and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997]

1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and

security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits

discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil

allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jennifer Oconnell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jennifer Oconnell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by

financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jennifer Oconnell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jennifer Oconnell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jennifer Oconnell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jennifer Oconnell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has

taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly

dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or

any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because

there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with

informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jennifer Oconnell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jennifer Oconnell, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally

against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jennifer Oconnell with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: bryan.may@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:17

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,

owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Bryan May** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Bryan May

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **bryan.may@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Bryan May, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Bryan May, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and

powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva

Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating,

obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as

in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new

client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Bryan May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Bryan May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Bryan May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Bryan May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Bryan May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Bryan May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Bryan May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Bryan May, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Bryan May with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: lindsay.mathyssen@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:16

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Lindsay Mathyssen** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Lindsay Mathyssen

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **lindsay.mathyssen@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Lindsay Mathyssen, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Lindsay Mathyssen, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King

James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Lindsay Mathyssen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Lindsay Mathyssen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Lindsay Mathyssen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Lindsay Mathyssen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Lindsay Mathyssen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Lindsay Mathyssen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are

aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Lindsay Mathyssen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Lindsay Mathyssen, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of

Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Lindsay Mathyssen with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: brian.masse@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:16

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Brian Masse** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Brian Masse

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **brian.masse@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Brian Masse, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical

organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Brian Masse, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military

receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food,

education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research,

Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of

unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to

extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless

damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to

them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The

administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Brian Masse, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Brian Masse, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Brian Masse, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Brian Masse, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Brian Masse, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Brian Masse, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Brian Masse, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Brian Masse, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Brian Masse with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: marie-france.lalonde@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:14

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **France Lalonde** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: France Lalonde

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marie-france.lalonde@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, France Lalonde, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, France Lalonde, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man France Lalonde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man France Lalonde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man France Lalonde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man France Lalonde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man France Lalonde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man France Lalonde, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by France Lalonde, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, France Lalonde, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, France Lalonde with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: irek.kusmierczyk@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:13

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Irek Kusmierczyk** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Irek Kusmierczyk

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **irek.kusmierczyk@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Irek Kusmierczyk, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Irek Kusmierczyk, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the

Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Irek Kusmierczyk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Irek Kusmierczyk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Irek Kusmierczyk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Irek Kusmierczyk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Irek Kusmierczyk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Irek Kusmierczyk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath

of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Irek Kusmierczyk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any

unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Irek Kusmierczyk, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Irek Kusmierczyk with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: shelby.kramp-neuman@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:13

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Shelby Neuman** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Shelby Neuman

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **shelby.kramp-neuman@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Shelby Neuman, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Shelby Neuman, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Shelby Neuman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Shelby Neuman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Shelby Neuman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Shelby Neuman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Shelby Neuman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Shelby Neuman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more

judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Shelby Neuman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Shelby Neuman, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Shelby Neuman with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: carol.hughes@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:10

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Carol Hughes** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Carol Hughes

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **carol.hughes@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Carol Hughes, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Carol Hughes, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Carol Hughes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Carol Hughes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Carol Hughes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Carol Hughes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Carol Hughes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Carol Hughes, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Carol Hughes, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Carol Hughes, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Carol Hughes with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: mark.holland@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:10

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Mark Holland** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Mark Holland

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mark.holland@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Mark Holland, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Mark Holland, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no

ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-

performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Holland, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Holland, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Holland, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Holland, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Holland, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Holland, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Mark Holland, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Mark Holland, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Mark Holland with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: lisa.hepfner@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:10

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Lisa Hepfner** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Lisa Hepfner

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **lisa.hepfner@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Lisa Hepfner, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Lisa Hepfner, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Lisa Hepfner, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Lisa Hepfner, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Lisa Hepfner, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Lisa Hepfner, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Lisa Hepfner, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Lisa Hepfner, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Lisa Hepfner, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Lisa Hepfner, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Lisa Hepfner with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: mona.fortier@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:07

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Mona Fortier** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Mona Fortier

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mona.fortier@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Mona Fortier, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Mona Fortier, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that

the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors.

Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance

requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the

OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Mona Fortier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Mona Fortier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Mona Fortier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Mona Fortier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Mona Fortier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Mona Fortier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Mona Fortier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Mona Fortier, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Mona Fortier with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: peter.fonseca@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:07

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Peter Fonseca** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Peter Fonseca

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **peter.fonseca@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Peter Fonseca, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Peter Fonseca, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Peter Fonseca, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Peter Fonseca, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Peter Fonseca, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Peter Fonseca, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Peter Fonseca, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Peter Fonseca, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Peter Fonseca, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Peter Fonseca, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Peter Fonseca with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: michelle.ferreri@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:07

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Michelle Ferreri** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Michelle Ferreri

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **michelle.ferreri@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Michelle Ferreri, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michelle Ferreri, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Ferreri, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Ferreri, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Ferreri, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Ferreri, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Ferreri, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Ferreri, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Michelle Ferreri, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Michelle Ferreri, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Michelle Ferreri with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: scot.davidson@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:04

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Scot Davidson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Scot Davidson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **scot.davidson@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Scot Davidson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Scot Davidson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Scot Davidson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Scot Davidson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Scot Davidson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Scot Davidson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Scot Davidson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Scot Davidson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Scot Davidson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Scot Davidson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Scot Davidson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: pam.damoff@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:04

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Pam Damoff** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Pam Damoff

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **pam.damoff@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Pam Damoff, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Pam Damoff, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Pam Damoff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Pam Damoff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Pam Damoff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Pam Damoff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Pam Damoff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Pam Damoff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Pam Damoff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Pam Damoff, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Pam Damoff with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: julie.dabrusin@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:04

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Julie Dabrusin** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Julie Dabrusin

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **julie.dabrusin@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Julie Dabrusin, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Julie Dabrusin, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dabrusin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dabrusin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dabrusin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dabrusin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dabrusin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dabrusin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Julie Dabrusin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Julie Dabrusin, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Julie Dabrusin with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: john.brassard@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:01

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **John Brassard** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: John Brassard

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **john.brassard@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, John Brassard, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, John Brassard, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man John Brassard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man John Brassard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man John Brassard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man John Brassard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man John Brassard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man John Brassard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by John Brassard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, John Brassard, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, John Brassard with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: valerie.bradford@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:01

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Valerie Bradford** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Valerie Bradford

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **valerie.bradford@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Valerie Bradford, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Valerie Bradford, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the

functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed

with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good

standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Valerie Bradford, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Valerie Bradford, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD

Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful

living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in

writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Valerie Bradford, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary

breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Valerie Bradford, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Valerie Bradford, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Valerie Bradford, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths

of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’;

and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws

into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Valerie Bradford, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Valerie Bradford, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Valerie Bradford with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: bill.blair@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:00

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Bill Blair** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Bill Blair

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **bill.blair@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Bill Blair, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Bill Blair, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function

of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract,

ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Bill Blair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Bill Blair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Bill Blair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Bill Blair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Bill Blair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Bill Blair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Bill Blair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Bill Blair, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Bill Blair with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: dean.allison@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:58

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Dean Allison** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Dean Allison

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **dean.allison@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Dean Allison, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Dean Allison, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Dean Allison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Dean Allison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Dean Allison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Dean Allison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Dean Allison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Dean Allison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Dean Allison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Dean Allison, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Dean Allison with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: shafqat.ali@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:58

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Shafqat Ali** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Shafqat Ali

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **shafqat.ali@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Shafqat Ali, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Shafqat Ali, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the

company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice

Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and

determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik

Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President

of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Shafqat Ali, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Shafqat Ali, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in

this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Shafqat Ali, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Shafqat Ali, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Shafqat Ali, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Shafqat Ali, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Shafqat Ali, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Shafqat Ali, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Shafqat Ali with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: omar.alghabra@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:57

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Omar Alghabra** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Omar Alghabra

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **omar.alghabra@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Omar Alghabra, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Omar Alghabra, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Omar Alghabra, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Omar Alghabra, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Omar Alghabra, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Omar Alghabra, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Omar Alghabra, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Omar Alghabra, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Omar Alghabra, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Omar Alghabra, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Omar Alghabra with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: chris.dentremont@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:55

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Chris Dentremont** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Chris Dentremont

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **chris.dentremont@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Chris Dentremont, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Chris Dentremont, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the

Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Dentremont, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Dentremont, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Dentremont, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Dentremont, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Dentremont, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Dentremont, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule

for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Chris Dentremont, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Chris Dentremont, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Chris Dentremont with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: kody.blois@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:55

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Kody Blois** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Kody Blois

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kody.blois@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Kody Blois, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Kody Blois, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper

House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond

the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of

alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of

fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and

financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that

this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new

client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Kody Blois, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Kody Blois, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Kody Blois, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Kody Blois, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Kody Blois, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Kody Blois, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Kody Blois, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Kody Blois, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Kody Blois with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: jaime.battiste@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:54

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jaime Battiste** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jaime Battiste

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jaime.battiste@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jaime Battiste, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jaime Battiste, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jaime Battiste, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jaime Battiste, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jaime Battiste, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jaime Battiste, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jaime Battiste, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jaime Battiste, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jaime Battiste, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jaime Battiste, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jaime Battiste with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: jake.stewart@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jake Stewart** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jake Stewart

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jake.stewart@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jake Stewart, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jake Stewart, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jake Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jake Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jake Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jake Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jake Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jake Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Jake Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jake Stewart, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jake Stewart with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: ginette.petitpastaylor@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ginette Petitpastaylor** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ginette Petitpastaylor

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ginette.petitpastaylor@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ginette Petitpastaylor, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ginette Petitpastaylor, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially

performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II

and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a

Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor

(Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have

received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve

the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled

others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of "Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five

million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private

Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a "Know Your Client Form" proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ginette Petitpastaylor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ginette Petitpastaylor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ginette Petitpastaylor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ginette Petitpastaylor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ginette Petitpastaylor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ginette Petitpastaylor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ginette Petitpastaylor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ginette Petitpastaylor with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: rob.moore@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:51

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rob Moore** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rob Moore

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rob.moore@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rob Moore, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rob Moore, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper

House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond

the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of

alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of

fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and

financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that

this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new

client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Moore, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Moore, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Moore, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Moore, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Moore, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Moore, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rob Moore, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rob Moore, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rob Moore with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: larry.maguire@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Larry Maguire** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Larry Maguire

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **larry.maguire@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Larry Maguire, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Larry Maguire, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Maguire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Maguire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Maguire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Maguire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Maguire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Maguire, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Larry Maguire, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Larry Maguire, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Larry Maguire with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: branden.leslie@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Branden Leslie** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Branden Leslie

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **branden.leslie@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Branden Leslie, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Branden Leslie, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

“Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Branden Leslie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Branden Leslie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Branden Leslie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Branden Leslie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Branden Leslie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Branden Leslie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Branden Leslie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Branden Leslie, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Branden Leslie with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: kevin.lamoureux@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Kevin Lamoureux** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Kevin Lamoureux

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kevin.lamoureux@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Kevin Lamoureux, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Kevin Lamoureux, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of

statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place

yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in

part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Lamoureux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Lamoureux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty,

enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Lamoureux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Lamoureux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Lamoureux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Lamoureux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not

regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in

what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving

my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Kevin Lamoureux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Kevin Lamoureux, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Kevin Lamoureux with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: bonita.zarrillo@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:46

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Bonita Zarrillo** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Bonita Zarrillo

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **bonita.zarrillo@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Bonita Zarrillo, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Bonita Zarrillo, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN

Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can

authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law,

courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by

omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in

law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest

performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and

informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or

woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”,

had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property

owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services

for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling

mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the

client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager

and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with

no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach

of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Bonita Zarrillo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Bonita Zarrillo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by

private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate

the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not

limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Bonita Zarrillo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Bonita Zarrillo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Bonita Zarrillo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Bonita Zarrillo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit

admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the

ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained

contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Bonita Zarrillo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Bonita Zarrillo, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction

of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Bonita Zarrillo with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: jonathan.wilkinson@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:45

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jonathan Wilkinson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jonathan Wilkinson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jonathan.wilkinson@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jonathan Wilkinson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jonathan Wilkinson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil

rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights,

Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding

provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency

effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights,

along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this

case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the

proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard

trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form

the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing

of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then

notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability

to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that

requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the

lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jonathan Wilkinson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest

performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jonathan Wilkinson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your

obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any

matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to

restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jonathan Wilkinson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jonathan Wilkinson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jonathan Wilkinson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly

correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jonathan Wilkinson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission

has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given.” Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used

by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of

Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Jonathan Wilkinson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jonathan Wilkinson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jonathan Wilkinson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: patrick.weiler@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:45

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Patrick Weiler** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Patrick Weiler

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **patrick.weiler@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Patrick Weiler, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Patrick Weiler, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no

ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-

performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Weiler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Weiler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Weiler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Weiler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Weiler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Weiler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Patrick Weiler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Patrick Weiler, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Patrick Weiler with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: rob.morrison@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:43

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rob Morrison** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rob Morrison

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rob.morrison@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rob Morrison, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rob Morrison, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Morrison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Morrison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Morrison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Morrison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Morrison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rob Morrison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rob Morrison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rob Morrison, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rob Morrison with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: wilson.miao@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:42

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Wilson Miao** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Wilson Miao

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **wilson.miao@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Wilson Miao, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Wilson Miao, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that

the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors.

Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance

requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the

OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Wilson Miao, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Wilson Miao, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Wilson Miao, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Wilson Miao, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Wilson Miao, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Wilson Miao, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Wilson Miao, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Wilson Miao, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Wilson Miao with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: ron.mckinnon@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:42

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ron Mckinnon** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ron Mckinnon

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ron.mckinnon@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ron Mckinnon, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ron Mckinnon, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ron Mckinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ron Mckinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ron Mckinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ron Mckinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ron Mckinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ron Mckinnon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ron Mckinnon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ron Mckinnon, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ron Mckinnon with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: kerry-lynne.findlay@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:39

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Lynne Findlay** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Lynne Findlay

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kerry-lynne.findlay@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Lynne Findlay, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Lynne Findlay, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Lynne Findlay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Lynne Findlay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Lynne Findlay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Lynne Findlay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Lynne Findlay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Lynne Findlay, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Lynne Findlay, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Lynne Findlay, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Lynne Findlay with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: ed.fast@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:39

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ed Fast** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ed Fast

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ed.fast@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ed Fast, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ed Fast, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards,

universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of

statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child

underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the

man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also

affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or

woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had

provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to

remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name],

the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then

needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were

approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was

given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit

at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ed Fast, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ed Fast, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with

ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ed Fast, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ed Fast, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ed Fast, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ed Fast, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ed Fast, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ed Fast, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ed Fast with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: todd.doherty@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:39

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Todd Doherty** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Todd Doherty

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **todd.doherty@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Todd Doherty, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Todd Doherty, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that

the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors.

Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance

requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the

OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Todd Doherty, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Todd Doherty, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Todd Doherty, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Todd Doherty, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Todd Doherty, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Todd Doherty, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Todd Doherty, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Todd Doherty, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Todd Doherty with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: parm.bains@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:36

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Parm Bains** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Parm Bains

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **parm.bains@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Parm Bains, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Parm Bains, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Parm Bains, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Parm Bains, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Parm Bains, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Parm Bains, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Parm Bains, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Parm Bains, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Parm Bains, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Parm Bains, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Parm Bains with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: taylor.bachrach@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:36

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Taylor Bachrach** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Taylor Bachrach

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **taylor.bachrach@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Taylor Bachrach, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Taylor Bachrach, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Taylor Bachrach, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Taylor Bachrach, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Taylor Bachrach, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Taylor Bachrach, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Taylor Bachrach, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Taylor Bachrach, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Taylor Bachrach, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Taylor Bachrach, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Taylor Bachrach with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: mel.arnold@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:36

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Mel Arnold** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Mel Arnold

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mel.arnold@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Mel Arnold, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Mel Arnold, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and

"Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD

had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in

accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC

Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Mel Arnold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Mel Arnold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the

above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Mel Arnold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Mel Arnold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Mel Arnold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Mel Arnold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Mel Arnold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Mel Arnold, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Mel Arnold with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: blake.richards@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:33

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Blake Richards** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Blake Richards

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **blake.richards@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Blake Richards, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Blake Richards, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Blake Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Blake Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Blake Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Blake Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Blake Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Blake Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Blake Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Blake Richards, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Blake Richards with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: michelle.rempel@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:33

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Michelle Rempel** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Michelle Rempel

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **michelle.rempel@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Michelle Rempel, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michelle Rempel, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Rempel, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Rempel, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Rempel, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Rempel, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Rempel, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Michelle Rempel, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath

of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Michelle Rempel, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any

unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Michelle Rempel, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Michelle Rempel with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: glen.motz@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:32

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Glen Motz** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Glen Motz

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **glen.motz@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Glen Motz, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Glen Motz, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of

private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Glen Motz, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Glen Motz, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Glen Motz, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Glen Motz, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Glen Motz, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Glen Motz, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Glen Motz, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Glen Motz, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Glen Motz with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: tom.kmiec@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:30

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Tom Kmiec** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Tom Kmiec

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **tom.kmiec@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Tom Kmiec, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Tom Kmiec, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and

responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Tom Kmiec, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Tom Kmiec, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Tom Kmiec, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Tom Kmiec, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Tom Kmiec, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Tom Kmiec, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Tom Kmiec, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Tom Kmiec, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Tom Kmiec with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: pat.kelly@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:29

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Pat Kelly** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Pat Kelly

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **pat.kelly@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Pat Kelly, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Pat Kelly, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil

had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of "Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as

detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares

from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65

and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00

for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging

the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares

to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered

in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Pat Kelly, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Pat Kelly, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Pat Kelly, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Pat Kelly, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Pat Kelly, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Pat Kelly, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Pat Kelly, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Pat Kelly, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Pat Kelly with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: matt.jeneroux@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:29

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Matt Jeneroux** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Matt Jeneroux

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **matt.jeneroux@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Matt Jeneroux, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Matt Jeneroux, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Matt Jeneroux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Matt Jeneroux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Matt Jeneroux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Matt Jeneroux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Matt Jeneroux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Matt Jeneroux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Matt Jeneroux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Matt Jeneroux, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Matt Jeneroux with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: john.barlow@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:26

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **John Barlow** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: John Barlow

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **john.barlow@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, John Barlow, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, John Barlow, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man John Barlow, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man John Barlow, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man John Barlow, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man John Barlow, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man John Barlow, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man John Barlow, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by John Barlow, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, John Barlow, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, John Barlow with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: ziad.aboultaif@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:26

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ziad Aboultaif** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ziad Aboultaif

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ziad.aboultaif@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ziad Aboultaif, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ziad Aboultaif, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ziad Aboultaif, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ziad Aboultaif, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ziad Aboultaif, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ziad Aboultaif, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ziad Aboultaif, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ziad Aboultaif, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ziad Aboultaif, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ziad Aboultaif, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ziad Aboultaif with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: charles.adler@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:26

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Charles Adler** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Charles Adler

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **charles.adler@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Charles Adler, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Charles Adler, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Charles Adler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Charles Adler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Charles Adler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Charles Adler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Charles Adler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Charles Adler, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Charles Adler, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Charles Adler, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Charles Adler with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: scott.tannas@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:23

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Scott Tannas** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Scott Tannas

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **scott.tannas@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Scott Tannas, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Scott Tannas, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

“Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no

ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-

performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Tannas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Tannas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Tannas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Tannas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Tannas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Tannas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Scott Tannas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Scott Tannas, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Scott Tannas with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: karen.sorensen@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:23

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Karen Sorensen** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Karen Sorensen

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **karen.sorensen@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Karen Sorensen, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Karen Sorensen, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Karen Sorensen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Karen Sorensen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Karen Sorensen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Karen Sorensen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Karen Sorensen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Karen Sorensen, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Karen Sorensen, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Karen Sorensen, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Karen Sorensen with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: larry.smith@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:23

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Larry Smith** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Larry Smith

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **larry.smith@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Larry Smith, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Larry Smith, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and

"Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD

had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in

accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC

Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the

above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Larry Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Larry Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Larry Smith, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Larry Smith with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: david.richards@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:21

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **David Richards** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: David Richards

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **david.richards@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, David Richards, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, David Richards, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man David Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man David Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man David Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man David Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man David Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man David Richards, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by David Richards, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, David Richards, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, David Richards with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: mohamed-iqbal.ravalia@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:53

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Iqbal Ravalia** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Iqbal Ravalia

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mohamed-iqbal.ravalia@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Iqbal Ravalia, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Iqbal Ravalia, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqbal Ravalia, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqbal Ravalia, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqbal Ravalia, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqbal Ravalia, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqbal Ravalia, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqbal Ravalia, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Iqbal Ravalia, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Iqbal Ravalia, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Iqbal Ravalia with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: jim.quinn@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:53

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jim Quinn** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jim Quinn

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jim.quinn@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jim Quinn, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jim Quinn, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards,

universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle

of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force

me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by

commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through

such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a

conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company.

TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling

mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the

client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and

RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from

you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of

fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jim Quinn, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jim Quinn, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien,

ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the

Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to

fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jim Quinn, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jim Quinn, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jim Quinn, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jim Quinn, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission

and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an

officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained

contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jim Quinn, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jim Quinn, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction

of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jim Quinn with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
FROM: Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
TO: servicedelivery9880@gmail.com
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52
ATTACHMENTS (20250423-225235-0004917): message.delivery–status , message.rfc822.eml

Message blocked

Your message to **tracy.muggli@sen.parl.gc.ca** has been blocked. See technical details below for more information.

The response from the remote server was:

```
550 #5.7.1 Your access to submit messages to this e-mail system has been rejected.
```

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: tracy.muggli@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Tracy Muggli** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Tracy Muggli

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **tracy.muggli@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Tracy Muggli, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Tracy Muggli, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that

the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors.

Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance

requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the

OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Tracy Muggli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Tracy Muggli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Tracy Muggli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Tracy Muggli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Tracy Muggli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Tracy Muggli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Tracy Muggli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Tracy Muggli, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Tracy Muggli with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: pierre.moreau@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Pierre Moreau** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Pierre Moreau

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **pierre.moreau@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Pierre Moreau, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Pierre Moreau, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Moreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Moreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Moreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Moreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Moreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Moreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Pierre Moreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Pierre Moreau, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Pierre Moreau with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: rosemary.moodie@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rosemary Moodie** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rosemary Moodie

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rosemary.moodie@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rosemary Moodie, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rosemary Moodie, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemary Moodie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemary Moodie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemary Moodie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemary Moodie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemary Moodie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemary Moodie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are

aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rosemary Moodie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rosemary Moodie, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of

Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rosemary Moodie with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: elizabeth.marshall@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:51

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Elizabeth Marshall** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Elizabeth Marshall

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **elizabeth.marshall@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Elizabeth Marshall, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an

ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Elizabeth Marshall, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military

receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues

as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and

Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of

unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of

person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless

damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine

the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the

prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights,

or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both

the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is

brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it

would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a "Know Your Client Form" proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares " and the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying "TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor's clients name)".

79. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a "Private Placement Agreement" to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing

of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then

notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability

to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that

requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the

lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth Marshall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest

performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth Marshall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your

obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any

matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to

restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth Marshall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth Marshall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth Marshall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly

correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth Marshall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission

has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given.” Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used

by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of

Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Elizabeth Marshall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Elizabeth Marshall, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Elizabeth Marshall with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: fabian.manning@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:51

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Fabian Manning** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Fabian Manning

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **fabian.manning@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Fabian Manning, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Fabian Manning, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Fabian Manning, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Fabian Manning, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Fabian Manning, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Fabian Manning, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Fabian Manning, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Fabian Manning, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Fabian Manning, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Fabian Manning, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Fabian Manning with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: michael.macdonald@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:51

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Michael Macdonald** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Michael Macdonald

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **michael.macdonald@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Michael Macdonald, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michael Macdonald, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of

statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith.

This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and

informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or

woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH,

2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The

Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President

of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield

TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share

certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged

the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according

to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to

include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial

interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical

standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed

in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Macdonald, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the

contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc.

A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for

any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court

finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is

used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words

describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be

altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Michael Macdonald, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God’s law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Michael Macdonald, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Michael Macdonald with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
FROM: Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
TO: servicedelivery9880@gmail.com
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50
ATTACHMENTS (20250423-225055-0000128): message.delivery−status , message.rfc822.eml

Message blocked

Your message to **margo.greenwood@sen.parl.gc.ca** has been blocked. See technical details below for more information.

The response from the remote server was:

```
550 #5.7.1 Your access to submit messages to this e-mail system has been rejected.
```

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: margo.greenwood@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Margo Greenwood** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Margo Greenwood

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **margo.greenwood@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Margo Greenwood, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Margo Greenwood, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on

Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and

which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada

(or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or

registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the

Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or

woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH,

2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The

Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President

of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield

TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share

certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged

the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according

to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to

include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Margo Greenwood, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial

interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Margo Greenwood, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical

standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Margo Greenwood, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Margo Greenwood, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed

in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Margo Greenwood, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Margo Greenwood, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the

contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc.

A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for

any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court

finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is

used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words

describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be

altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Margo Greenwood, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God’s law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Margo Greenwood, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Margo Greenwood with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
FROM: Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
TO: servicedelivery9880@gmail.com
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50
ATTACHMENTS (20250423-225045-0001427): message.delivery–status , message.rfc822.eml

Address not found

Your message wasn't delivered to **stephen.greene@sen.parl.gc.ca** because the address couldn't be found, or is unable to receive mail.

The response from the remote server was:

```
550 #5.1.0 Address rejected.
```

SUBJECT: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
FROM: Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
TO: servicedelivery9880@gmail.com
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50
ATTACHMENTS (20250423-225045-0013866): message.delivery–status , message.rfc822.eml

Message blocked

Your message to **marc.gold@sen.parl.gc.ca** has been blocked. See technical details below for more information.

The response from the remote server was:

```
550 #5.7.1 Your access to submit messages to this e-mail system has been rejected.
```

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: marc.gold@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Marc Gold** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Marc Gold

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marc.gold@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Marc Gold, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Marc Gold, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Gold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Gold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Gold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Gold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Gold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Gold, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Marc Gold, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Marc Gold, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Marc Gold with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: stephen.greene@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Stephen Greene** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Stephen Greene

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **stephen.greene@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Stephen Greene, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Stephen Greene, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephen Greene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephen Greene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephen Greene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephen Greene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephen Greene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephen Greene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Stephen Greene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Stephen Greene, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Stephen Greene with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: tony.dean@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Tony Dean** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Tony Dean

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **tony.dean@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Tony Dean, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Tony Dean, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and

"Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD

had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in

accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC

Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Dean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Dean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the

above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Dean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Dean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Dean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Dean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Tony Dean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Tony Dean, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Tony Dean with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: marty.deacon@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Marty Deacon** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Marty Deacon

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marty.deacon@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Marty Deacon, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Marty Deacon, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Marty Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Marty Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Marty Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Marty Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Marty Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Marty Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Marty Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Marty Deacon, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Marty Deacon with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: colin.deacon@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Colin Deacon** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Colin Deacon

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **colin.deacon@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Colin Deacon, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Colin Deacon, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Colin Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Colin Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Colin Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Colin Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Colin Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Colin Deacon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Colin Deacon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Colin Deacon, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Colin Deacon with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: andrew.cardozo@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Andrew Cardozo** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Andrew Cardozo

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **andrew.cardozo@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Andrew Cardozo, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Andrew Cardozo, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Andrew Cardozo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs

must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Andrew Cardozo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Andrew Cardozo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Andrew Cardozo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Andrew Cardozo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Andrew Cardozo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Andrew Cardozo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Andrew Cardozo, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Andrew Cardozo with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: bev.busson@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Bev Busson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Bev Busson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **bev.busson@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Bev Busson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Bev Busson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and

responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Bev Busson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Bev Busson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Bev Busson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Bev Busson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Bev Busson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Bev Busson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Bev Busson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Bev Busson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Bev Busson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: sharon.burey@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Sharon Burey** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Sharon Burey

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **sharon.burey@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Sharon Burey, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Sharon Burey, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Sharon Burey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Sharon Burey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Sharon Burey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Sharon Burey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Sharon Burey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Sharon Burey, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Sharon Burey, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Sharon Burey, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Sharon Burey with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: salma.ataullahjan@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Salma Ataullahjan** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Salma Ataullahjan

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **salma.ataullahjan@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Salma Ataullahjan, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Salma Ataullahjan, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for

example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor

(Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have

received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve

the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled

others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of "Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five

million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private

Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a "Know Your Client Form" proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Ataullahjan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Ataullahjan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Ataullahjan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Ataullahjan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Ataullahjan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Ataullahjan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Salma Ataullahjan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Salma Ataullahjan, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Salma Ataullahjan with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: rejean.aucoin@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rejean Aucoin** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rejean Aucoin

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rejean.aucoin@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rejean Aucoin, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rejean Aucoin, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper

House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond

the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of

alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of

fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and

financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that

this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase

the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified

Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rejean Aucoin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rejean Aucoin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rejean Aucoin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rejean Aucoin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rejean Aucoin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rejean Aucoin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rejean Aucoin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rejean Aucoin, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rejean Aucoin with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <servicedelivery9880@gmail.com>
TO: david.arnot@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **David Arnot** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: David Arnot

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **david.arnot@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, David Arnot, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, David Arnot, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the

company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice

Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and

determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik

Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President

of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man David Arnot, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man David Arnot, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in

this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man David Arnot, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man David Arnot, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man David Arnot, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man David Arnot, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by David Arnot, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, David Arnot, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, David Arnot with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!